

Development of Ideas of Management in Philosophical Thought



G.N. Kuzmenko

Abstract: *Management as a phenomenon of social practice received serious theoretical justification. The importance of management is reflected by the attention of philosophers to its nature, functions, and technology. The article provides analysis of key provisions of management philosophy in historical retrospective.*

Keywords: *management, management theory, methodology, philosophy, society, social philosophy.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Management is the most complicated phenomenon of social activity, ensuring the sustainable development of society. Hence, the requirements imposed on managers of various levels, in particular, of the top level, are high. Their ability to set goals, specify tasks and propose optimal solutions, select adequate personnel, exercise control over the rapidly changing situation determines the efficiency of the structure they lead, the effectiveness of many people's actions and, ultimately, their quality of life.

The phenomenon of management is organic to human nature, whose activity is not governed by instincts, but by culture, that is, it has a social basis. Effective managers are not born, a person becomes one in the process of mastering of specialized skills and knowledge, in the process of achieving the planned results by hard work, which includes both mistakes and breakthrough solutions. The activity of a true manager is an art form, synergy of experience, theory and intuition. It is this kind of leader that can organize atomized communities of people into motivated teams and achieve their goals.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The studies of historians, anthropologists, cultural scientists and representatives of other social and humanitarian sciences show that understanding of the important role of a leader was adequately evaluated even in ancient times, considering the constants of archaic consciousness. One of these constants is the magically interpreted nature of human activity. Therefore, heads of clans and clan unions, tribes and other social communities had special sacred status. A leader was a supreme magician who held the earthly order with the support of another world.

From the modern point of view, an archaic person considers the content of consciousness to be objective, moreover, he/she deifies it. The high magical status of archaic manager reveals the knowledge of the deified experience of previous generations, which is concentrated in the forms of ritual. It was deified because of its intrinsic importance since the ability to organize the reproduction of social experience by priestly leaders allowed the most ancient social communities to survive in the extremely harsh conditions of primitive existence, expand the sphere of their life activity, increase the new experience and pass it to the next generation. Under these conditions, it is difficult to overestimate the role of governing stratum, since the life of fellow tribesmen directly depended on his/her competence.

Even in ancient times, in fact, from the time of the Paleolithic, there was a special system for preparing the future elite, expressed in special, extremely sophisticated forms of initiation of young people. Many months of training with all sorts of tests on the part of older relatives led to the formation of a new managerial apparatus capable of solving the most complex tasks of its time. At the same time, the responsibility that lay on the managers of the time concerned their life and death in the truest sense of the word. As J. Fraser rightly noted, the archaic society did not forgive the mistakes of its leaders, moreover, it did not forgive the very possibility of reducing their managerial activity. Even the outward signs of impending powerlessness, for example, gray hair meant the death sentence for them.

Thousands of years passed, but the demands and respectful attitude towards the managerial layer remain unchanged. The first civilizations that emerged in the course of the Nile, the Euphrates and the Tigris, the Indus, the Yellow River and other rivers, deified their rulers and their administration. These are the first cultural heroes who gave to the human world speech, writing, agriculture, trade, medicine, architecture, etc. The creators of the first states in everyday consciousness were positioned as descendants of gods or as their incarnations on earth. Hence, the sacred sources of the knowledge they donated. Even after their death, these supermen continued to patronize their people from their tombs, turning into places of worship, like the pyramids of the pharaohs in Egypt.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The historical-philosophical analysis gives reason to conclude that the first management theorists were philosophers.

Revised Manuscript Received on October 30, 2019.

* Correspondence Author

G.N. Kuzmenko*, Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia.

© The Authors. Published by Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP). This is an [open access](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Development of Ideas of Management in Philosophical Thought

Thus, the philosophers of classical antiquity (China, India, Greece, Rome), arguing about society, focused their attention, primarily, on the rulers. The political sphere of society in the first attempts at social-philosophical reflection continues to be exaggeratedly sacred. In the first texts of the Veda (Rigveda) and philosophical commentaries to them (the Upanishads), in the first philosophical texts of Chinese thinkers, the activities of the rulers, organizing the order of society and increasing its welfare, are idealized to the limit. "The sage has no invariable mind of his own; he makes the mind of the people his mind", Tao de Jing says. "The sage does not accumulate (for himself). The more that he expends for others, the more does he possess of his own; the more that he gives to others, the more does he have himself" [1].

Plato in the "Statesman" dialogue assesses the role of governance by analogy with the eternal activity of the divine Being. "...after the separation, when the world was let go, at first all proceeded well enough; but, as time went there was more and more forgetting, and the old discord again held sway and burst forth in full glory ... he set them in order and restored them, and made the world imperishable and immortal." Hence, according to Plato, ontological autarky of the ruler and heteronomy of other estates (by analogy with the self-sufficiency of true being and dependence on him of something else): "...refer kings to a supreme or ruling-for-self science, leaving the rest to receive a name from someone else" [2].

The noted idea, as the dominant one, passed through all of Antiquity. In the Middle Ages, a figure of the ruler was also rated extremely high, even considering the prevailing monotheistic principle. "The emperor can rule ... as the "interim" of Christ, his deputy and vicar, vice-Christ. Let us recall that the title of the supreme head of Muslims, the caliph, has the same meaning of deputy, governor: he who replaces the Muhammad absent among the people", as the academician of RAS S.S. Averintsev wrote on this occasion [3].

During this period, a ruler's coronation and the belief that touching a king heals incurable diseases were various forms of the ruler's proximity to the sacred. Political leaders of lower rank ideally constituted a hierarchy of good intermediaries.

The works of social philosophers of the 15-17th centuries became a new stage in understanding the essence of management (first of all, political). Particularly noteworthy are the classic works "The Prince" by N. Machiavelli and "Leviathan" by T. Hobbes. From their point of view, power does not depend on the divine nature of the ruler, as ancient philosophers asserted, and on divine commission and predestination, as medieval thinkers believed. Power is the realization of a complex of reasons that have the earthly, worldly character. Among such reasons, for example, Machiavelli singled out a set of objective conditions ("fortune") and personal abilities and talents of a manager ("valor").

The thesis of Hobbes that God does not interfere in the affairs of people (derived from the general direction of religious and philosophical thought of Protestantism) is important for political reflection. This thesis problematized traditional conservatism in the activities of political elites. Administrative models of past epochs in modern times lost

their sacred status and ceased to be binding. Now traditional models were not perceived by society as the ideal ones, that is, as given from the above perfect being. Therefore, they demanded constant improvements. As a result, there was a request for managerial innovation. Innovations in political management in the modern period were correlated with innovations in other areas of society, primarily in the economy. This is a completely natural phenomenon associated with significant changes that were associated with the rise of the "third estate", the development of bourgeois relations [4].

At the beginning of the 19th century, the Western world came to the formation, first of all, of empirical, and then of scientific management, as the special sphere of social management, primarily connected with business management. The development of capitalism led to the fact that art of management, which is closely related to the personality of manager, was transformed into technology, i.e. became a profession. In 1881, the first in the modern sense Wharton business school was opened at the University of Pennsylvania.

Probably, it should be said separately about this school founded by businessman-philanthropist J. Wharton, since it still occupies the first places in the ratings of world business schools and has become a model for projects in different countries. Currently, about 4,000 students are studying full-time at Wharton, more than 80,000 students from nearly 140 countries study in network education programs. The offered specialties are "Business and Public Policy", "Finance", "Insurance and Entrepreneurial Risk", "Management", "Marketing", "Statistics" "Operations and Information Management", "Real Estate", "Management and Policy in the Field of Health" etc. The Summer School of Management and Technology, the Summer Institute of Business and Technology, and the Leadership in the Business World program operate within the school. The school includes the publishing house "Wharton School Publishing".

After the creation of business school on the basis of the University of Pennsylvania, similar schools have been opened in other educational institutions, and the specialized scientific and educational network is developed. Currently, administrative and management education is offered by the leaders of the world higher education institutions, leading universities of the USA, Great Britain, France, Japan and other developed countries. The top ten are:

1. Harvard Business School (USA);
2. Stanford Graduate School of Business (USA);
3. University of Pennsylvania: Wharton (USA);
4. London Business School (UK);
5. Columbia Business School (USA);
6. Insead (France);
7. Iese Business School (Spain);
8. Hong Kong UST Business School (China);
9. MIT: Sloan (USA);
10. University of Chicago: Booth (USA).

The turnover of this top ten exceeds 1 billion dollars a year (data for 2014).

Due to the interest in the phenomenon of management by the end of the 20 – beginning of the 21 centuries the whole branch of scientific knowledge and educational practices is developing (for example, the famous MBA, MHR and other training courses). The range of subjects, topics and questions in business schools seems endless. The curricula of modern management work out in detail the problems of technology and hierarchy of managerial actions, methods and techniques for effectively ensuring results, optimizing management schemes at different levels of organization and many others.

At the same time, despite the applied nature of "management science", listeners are invariably attracted by interest and deeper, theoretical issues related to the nature of management, organization and management mechanisms, its types (management, functioning, administration, etc.), with its role in social institutions, as well as issues of correlation of management with property, knowledge, creativity, etc. It is of interest to consider the prospects for development of this particular type of activity in the post-industrial society and others [5].

That is why the fundamental works, with which students get acquainted in the first place, are works that have not narrow thematic profile, but socio-philosophical one. Famous thinkers of the 19-20 centuries devote their works to the problems of management. The names of some of them became nominal due to the contribution they made to the theory and practice of management.

However, first, it should be noted that the problem of social management was thoroughly examined by the classics of Marxism: K. Marx in "Capital", F. Engels in "Anti-Dühring". In their social predictions, they considered the enlargement and complication of production to be one of the conditions for the need of proletarian revolution, which went beyond the competence of the owner and required special forms of management, hence the thesis of Marxist classics that "the technical basis of large-scale industry is revolutionary one" [6].

F. Taylor (1856-1915), the founder of the scientific organization of labor and management, the founder of the Society for Promotion of Scientific Management in the United States, paid special attention to this problem. Taylor's main area of interest was the rationalization of activities, he is the author of hundreds of patents in this area. However, in his main work, "The Principles of Scientific Management", written in 1911, Taylor draws theoretical conclusions about the social meaning of organizational changes that he promoted in labor and management.

The main beneficiary of innovation, according to the scientist, is the nation as a whole. The national interest, concluded in the growth of quantity and quality of services to citizens, determines the meaning of the activities of industrial, financial, educational and other management. "The search for better, more competent people to perform functions — ranging from the presidents of our large companies," as Taylor wrote, "has never been more urgent than in our time" [7]. In other words, Taylor believed that the right of ownership does not give the careless owner the right to control his enterprises. It should be specially trained people for managing, which in the current terminology are called professional managers or managers. For capitalism of that

time, this was a monstrous heresy, and Taylor was called a socialist in the press.

Apparently, it was not by chance that Taylor's scientific studies and their social and philosophical content were noted by V.I. Lenin in 1913-1914. They indicated not only "a number of the richest scientific achievements in the analysis of mechanical movements in labor ... introduction of the best accounting and control systems, etc." [8]. Later, V.I. Lenin emphasized: "The Taylor system — without the knowledge and against the will of its authors — is preparing the time when proletariat will take over all social production and appoint its own workers, commissions for the proper distribution and streamlining of all social labor" [9]. Industrialization in the USSR was carried out, among other things, by Taylor's like-minded people representing American consulting firms.

One of the most influential theorists of management of the 20 century – P. Drucker (1909-2005), is known as a prominent scientist who analyzed the philosophical foundations of management. His most famous works – "The Future of Industrial Man" (1942), "Theory of Corporation" (1946), "The Invisible Revolution" (1976), "Management in Epoch of Changes" (1980), "New Realities" (1989), "Post-capitalist society" (1993) – are, among other things, social and philosophical works. The main reason for this lies in Drucker's firm conviction of the following: philosophical knowledge, the theory of society, cultural studies and other backbone sciences of the social and humanitarian profile provide a manager's strategic depth of vision. Only such deep levels of theorizing allow the management layer to understand global trends, predict new conditions for life and generate new knowledge.

By the way, Drucker himself demonstrates the serious potential of such an approach with illustrative examples. In his work "Post-Capitalist Future", he shows how such form of information, like "knowledge", quickly turns into defining factor of production, pushing both capital and labor into the background. The whole chapter of the book is devoted to specifics of knowledge, its meaningful definitions and that there were "many theories about the limits and nature of knowledge — as many as there were metaphysicians in the history of philosophy, beginning with Plato (400 BC) and ending with Ludwig Wittgenstein" [10]. Drucker also wrote about the concept of technology as "organized, systematic, purposeful knowledge", examined the history of technology, vocational education, and so on. Only after such a comprehensive analysis, he drew his famous conclusion about the upcoming offensive of the "Society of Knowledge" and about radical transformations in the future for which the captains of world management must be prepared.

P. A. Sorokin (1889-1968), the eminent Russian and American sociologist and cultural scientist, can also be attributed to scientists who indicated philosophical knowledge as the basis of successful management activities. Sorokin considered social life as a complex system consisting of subsystems relating to religion, ethics, economics, politics, law, science, art, and so on.

He was one of the first to focus on morality as the basic component of management. Sorokin repeatedly returned to this topic in his works, in particular, in the second volume of the famous "Social and Cultural Dynamics", which was entirely devoted to the problems of "fluctuations of the systems of truth, ethics and law". The fact that the scientist founded the Center for Study of Creative Altruism at Harvard says a lot.

The famous American sociologist, the founder of the school of structural functionalism T. Parsons (1902-1976) made his contribution to the socio-philosophical theory of management. The structural-functional analysis proposed by the scientist is the principle of the study of social phenomena and processes as a system in which each element of the structure has a specific purpose (function). Social systems, according to Parsons, are institutional systems considered as stable sets of rules, norms, and attitudes governing human behavior and transforming it into a system of roles and statuses.

The social system has a structure with interrelated levels: individual — group (collectives) — institutions — society as a whole. Each of these levels has its own type of hierarchy. So, at the managerial level, from the point of view of the American sociologist, the problems of the effectiveness of business organizations functioning, more precisely, the business organization of individuals are considered. Such a process is called management. The emphasis placed on the managerial type by the scientist allowed him to isolate the specifics of management, develop criteria for management effectiveness, such as focusing on results (and not on the process), consumer needs (and not leadership), competition (and not monopoly), prevention (and not therapy), etc. The justification and application of these criteria allow creating optimal management models in various fields, including political ones [11], [12].

We specifically note that "managerism" (this is the term used by Parsons) is a specific concept developed not only by him but also, for example, by Drucker and Sorokin. This concept absolutized the role of production managers (managers) in the development of society. According to it, in the process of developing complex forms of management, capitalist owners are forced to delegate large volumes of functions, including control functions, to hired managers. The interests of the latter — administrators, bureaucrats, and military persons — do not at all coincide with the interests of their employers.

This process was described most vividly in 1940 by J. Burnham in his work "The Managerial Revolution". Interestingly, Burnham did not distinguish between capitalist and socialist states, that is, he was in the point of view of convergence, which was widespread in the scientific community after the 1960s. If we talk about the management layer, its meaning lies in the fact that class character of Western management and socialist nomenclature is identical: managers are a new class that displaces owners and forms industrial super-states and transnational companies.

IV. CONCLUSION

Leaving aside the theoretical studies of other well-known scientists – social philosophers, sociologists, economists and others – let us note once again the relevance of the topic under consideration.

Now, management is an expanding system of practical skills aimed at using experience and knowledge, objectively reflecting the complex structure of post-industrial reality. Hence, the philosophy of management should occupy and occupies the important place in the structure of theory and practice of social management. It should reveal the ontological, epistemological, axiological and other bases of management. It concerns not only the philosophical synthesis of the sciences of management and the methodology of its research but also the practical side of philosophical reflection [13], [14].

The philosophy of social management is the necessary theoretical and methodological basis, on which the holistic understanding of the picture of the world grows. The deeply reflexive position of a social manager allows him/her to effectively transform problems (non-standard situations) into tasks (sets of consecutive steps to solve them) and make the choice of the optimal course of action. Of course, there are various specialists or services for searching, analyzing and preparing options in the organization. However, the concept of optimal choice also implies a manager-analyst, a manager-theorist, and finally, a manager-strategist [15], [16].

REFERENCES

1. Lao Tzu, *Tao Te Ching*. Saint Petersburg: Lenizdat, 2013.
2. Plato. *Statesman*. Moscow: Renaissance, 2015.
3. S. S. Averintsev, *Poetics of the early Byzantine literature*. Saint Petersburg: Azbuka-klassika, 2004.
4. G. N. Kuzmenko, "Leader with philosophical education: Platonic ideal in the modern era", *Sotsial'naya politika i sotsiologiya*, vol. 16(2-121), 2017, pp. 172-179.
5. A. M. Rupova, "Anti-globalist optimism of A. Schütz and K. Geertz", *Social Studies*, vol. 4, 2008, pp. 138-143.
6. K. Marx, "Capital", in *Sochineniya*, 2nd ed. vol. 23, K. Marx, and F. Engels. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoye Izdatelstvo Politicheskoy Literatury, 1960.
7. F. W. Taylor, *Principles of scientific management*. Moscow: Kontrolling Publ., 1991.
8. V. I. Lenin, "The immediate tasks of the Soviet government", in *Poln. sobr. Soch.*, vol. 36, V. I. Lenin. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Politicheskoy Literatury, 1970, pp. 167-208.
9. V. I. Lenin, "Taylor's system – enslavement of man by machine", in *Poln. sobr. Soch.*, vol. 24, V. I. Lenin. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Politicheskoy Literatury, 1973, pp. 369-371.
10. P. Drucker, P., "Posteconomic society", in *New Postindustrial Wave in the West. An anthology*, V. L. Inozemtsev, Ed. Moscow: Academia, 1999, pp. 19-47.
11. T. I. Koval, L. F. Matronina, and O. B. Skorodumova, "Management in the knowledge society: tendencies and prospects", *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, vol. 9(12), 2016, pp. 173-178.
12. I. M. Melikov, and O. B. Skorodumova, "New trends in the social management of information societ", *Sotsial'naya politika i sotsiologiya*, vol. 16(6-125), 2017, pp. 150-157.
13. G. I. Avtsinova, G. N. Kuzmenko, I. M. Melikov, and G. P. Otyutskiy, "Information anthropology: methodological approaches of the Russian scientists", *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, vol. 9(11), 2016, pp. 89424.
14. K. V. Birukova, L. I. Bystrova, O. A. Evreeva, G. P. Otyutskiy, and R. M. Rupova, "Religious and philosophical ideas and ecclesiastical education of the Russian émigré community", *European Journal of Science and Theology*, vol. 12(3), 2016, pp. 165-180.
15. G. P. Otyutsky, "Management philosophy as a scientific discipline: a problem field and methodological approaches", *Sotsial'naya politika i sotsiologiya*, vol. 15(6-119), 2016, pp. 168-175.
16. G. N. Kuzmenko, and G. P. Otyutsky, "What can philosophy give to management?", *Sotsial'naya politika i sotsiologiya*, vol. 16(1-120), 2017, pp. 158-165.